



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,985	07/11/2001	Imran Sharif	UNIQA-PPA1	1925
27627	7590	12/29/2004	EXAMINER	
ROBERT BUCKLEY, PATENT ATTORNEY P.O BOX 6780 STATELINE, NV 89449-6780			VUONG, JASON DUY ANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/902,985

Applicant(s)

SHARIF ET AL.

Examiner

Jason D. A. Vuong

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-25-2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Oath/Declaration***

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not include the notary's signature, or the notary's signature is in the wrong place.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:  
inconsistency in the disclosure.

Appropriate correction is required.

Line 24 on Page 11 mentions that the user can directly enter text-searchable information; this fact is not supported anywhere in the specification. In fact, the specification itself does not allow the use of a full text-entry keyboard (Page 7 Line 11). It is impossible for the user to enter text-searchable information without the use of a full text-entry keyboard. Therefore, the user cannot possibly enter the text information.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 and 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,028,679 to Murphy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,631,745 to Wong et al.

Regarding **Claim 1**, Murphy discloses an Internet device that is capable of transmitting and receiving fax messages (see Figure 8). The device has a network connection section for communication with a network (see Figure 8 Element POTS); this device is capable of communicating using both data and fax protocols (refer to Column 4 Lines 32-33). The CPU (see Figure 8 Element 72) and the ASIC chip (see Figure 8 Element 64) control the communication of this device (refer to Column 4 Lines 28-35). However, Murphy does not disclose a video section that generates video signals for displaying fax messages on the video display, and a reduced-keyset user interface that generates user interface signals to be received by the user interface signal receiver.

Wong et al., on the other hand, disclose a communication device that includes a video section (see Figure 2 Elements 115, 119, 18, and 18', and also

Art Unit: 2626

Figure 1 Elements 17 and 18) for generating video signals, and a user interface section (see Figure 2 Elements 113 and 33). The video section has the ability to generate video signals to be displayed on a CRT or a standard television (refer to Column 6 Lines 29-32). According to the disclosure, received fax messages and other status information (refer to Column 11 Lines 12-16) can be displayed on a television set (Column 1 Lines 36-37). The user is able to communicate with the device via the interface section (refer to Column 6 Lines 26-28). The processor (see Figure 2 Element 51) controls every component contained in the device including the video (see Figure 2 Elements 115, 119, 18, and 18') and network (see Figure 2 Elements 83, 85, and 86) interfaces. Wong et al.'s device can also communicate using both fax and data protocols (refer to Column 5 Lines 45-46); although Wong et al. do not explicitly mention the word "protocol," but it is clear that their device must support fax and data protocols in order to handle both fax and data traffic.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine Wong et al.'s disclosed functionalities (video display, and user interface) with Murphy's disclosed invention to create an Internet device that is capable of transmitting and receiving fax messages; the device also provides a video interface to display fax messages, and a user interface that allows the user to selectively view the fax messages. The motivation to do so is to reduce paper cost and provide flexible use. By simply deleting the fax messages displayed on the video display, the user can reduce the paper cost; the user does not have to print every incoming fax message. Therefore, cost is reduced. The user can

Art Unit: 2626

enjoy the flexible use by using the remote control to selectively view the fax messages.

Regarding **Claim 6**, Wong et al. disclose that a printer can be connected to the invented device to print the fax messages (refer to Column 3 Lines 53-55).

4. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,028,679 to Murphy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,631,745 to Wong et al. as applied to **Claims 1 and 6** above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,019 B1 to Mousseau et al.

Regarding **Claim 5**, both Murphy and Wong et al. do not disclose the transmission of a read-receipt after displaying a fax message. Mousseau et al., however, disclose a redirector that will direct a read-receipt to the message sender (refer to Column 24 Lines 40-45).

Therefore, those skilled in the art will recognize that it would have been obvious to utilize Mousseau et al.'s method of providing a read-receipt to the sender. The motivation to do so is provide assurance; after receiving the read-receipt, the sender would be assured that his/her fax was transmitted correctly, and that the other user has read it.

5. **Claims 2 and 3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,028,679 to Murphy in view of U.S. Patent

Art Unit: 2626

No. 5,631,745 to Wong et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,178 to Lloyd et al.

Regarding Claim 2, Wong et al., and Murphy do not disclose the use of a fax server to store fax messages.

However, Lloyd et al. disclose the use of a fax server to store fax messages (see Figure 2 Element 224, and refer to Column 8 Lines 41-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a fax server as taught by Lloyd et al.; the motivation to do so is to provide an additional feature of remotely storing fax messages, and it further increases storage capacity. Also, it is conventional to use a fax server in systems like that of Murphy and Wong et al.'s for remote storage and archiving of messages.

Regarding Claim 3, according to Figure 2 of Lloyd et al.'s disclosure, the simultaneous connection to the fax system, and the fax server is clearly illustrated. The fax machine (Figure 2 Element 216) is connected to the fax server (Figure 2 Element 224) via the connection 250 (Figure 2 Element 250). The client computer (Figure 2 Element 212) is also connected to the fax server (Figure 2 Element 224) via the network (Figure 2 Element 240). Therefore the simultaneous connection is established. Incoming fax messages can be stored on the fax server as disclosed (refer to Column 8 Lines 41-42).

Art Unit: 2626

6. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,028,679 to Murphy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,631,745 to Wong et al., and further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,178 to Lloyd et al. as applied to **Claims 2 and 3** above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,369 to Hussey.

Regarding **Claim 4**, Murphy, Wong et al., and Lloyd do not disclose the search and filtering functions, which can be used to search for fax messages. Hussey, on the other hand, provides "filters" such that email messages can be searched (refer to Column 9 Lines 12-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the search concept as taught by Hussey to filter, catalog, and search for certain fax messages; the motivation to do so is to provide convenience to the user. The user will find it convenient to just read the fax messages of interest.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Jason Vuong at 703-306-4157. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

